Zeno implicitly affirms God to be a body, whether he mean him to be the whole corporeal universe, or some particular body ; for if God were incorporeal, how could he be spherical? nor could he then either move or rest, being not properly in any place : but if God be a body, then nothing hinders but that he may be moved.™ From which and other places of Aristotle, it. is plain enough also, that he did suppose incorporeal substance to be unextended, and as such, not to have relation to any place. But this is a thing to be disputed afterwards. Indeed some learned men conceive Aristotle to have reprehended Zeno withoutcause, and that Zeno made God to be a sphere, or spherical, in no other sense, than Parmenrdes did ia that known verse of his :[a]

u <r<$a.l£a.q IvaXiywov o'yjcw.

Wherein he is understood to describe the Divine eternity. However, it plainly appears from hence, that according to Aristptle's sense, God was aW-^ jttaroc, an incorporeal substance distinct from the world.

xxi. Now this doctrine, which Plato especially was famous for asserting, that there was owia aW-/mroc, incorporeal substance,— and that the souls of men were such, but principally the Deity; Epicurus taking notice of it, endeavoured with all his might to confute it, arguing sometimes?,, after this aianner :[b] There can be no incorporeal God (as Plato maintaiaed), not only because no man can frame a conception of an incorporeal

[a] Apud Aristot. in libro jam laudato, cap. iv. p. 843. torn. ii. open et apud Platonem in Sopbista, et vcterum alios. [b] Cicero de Nat.ur, .Deor. lib. i. cap. s«. p. -28117. torn. ix. oper.